

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10)**Applicant(s): **Kenneth S. Morley et al.**

Docket No.

**11960.3112**

Application No.

**09/658,108**

Filing Date

**September 8, 2000**

Examiner

**Phuongchi T. Nguyen**

Customer No.

**022913**

Group Art Unit

**2833**Invention: **CONNECTOR SCHEME TO ALLOW PHYSICAL ORIENTATION OF A COMPUTER PERIPHERAL**

I hereby certify that the following correspondence:

**Issue Fee Transmittal Letter (1 pg., in duplicate); PTOL-85B Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate); Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance (1 pg.); PTO-2038 Credit Card Form in the amount of \$1,403.00; postcard; and Certificate of Express Mailing Label No. EV 627 626 608 US**

*(Identify type of correspondence)*

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

**March 28, 2005***(Date)***ERIC L. MASCHOFF***(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric L. Maschoff".

*(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)***EV 627 626 608 US***("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)***Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.**



PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No: 11960.3112

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: )  
 )  
 Kenneth S. Morley et al. )  
 )  
 Serial No: 09/658,108 ) Art Unit  
 ) 2833  
 Filed: September 8, 2000 )  
 )  
 For: CONNECTOR SCHEME TO ALLOW PHYSICAL )  
 ORIENTATION OF A COMPUTER PERIPHERAL )  
 )  
 Examiner: Phuongchi T. Nguyen )

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communication mailed on December 28, 2004. The Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 28, 2005

By:

ERIC L. MASCHOFF  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,596  
Customer No. 022913